REMARKS

In the recent Office Action, the Examiner restricted examination of the present application under 35 U.S.C. §121 to one of the following species of inventions:

- Ia. Claim 1, drawn to a wire feeder that includes a storage tray formed with a housing of the wire feeder and a wire spool support connected to the housing, with the wire spool support having a wire spool support tray, an elevated member, and a spool retention member connected to the elevated member and rotatably supporting the wire spool (embodiment of Figures 2 and 3).
- Ib. Claims 2-25, drawn to a wire feeder having a wire advancing mechanism and tray in a housing of the wire feeder (embodiment of Figure 1).
- Ic. Claims 26-32, drawn to a wire feeder that includes a wire spool support connected to a housing of the wire feeder, with the wire spool support having a bin, an elevated member extending from the b in, and a spool retention member connected to the elevated member and rotatably supporting the wire spool (embodiment of Figure 3).

In response thereto, Applicant elects to continue examination of the species of

group 1b, which includes original claims 2-25. Further, Applicant has amended claims 26-

32, which were indicated by the Examiner to be drawn toward a separate species. By this

amendment, it is believed that claims 26-32, which have been amended to depend from

elected independent claim 2, are no longer distinct from the claims of the elected group.

Accordingly, it is requested that examination continue on claims 2-32. In other words,

Applicant submits that claims 2-32 are all readable upon elected species and generic to all

species. If, for some reason, the Examiner does not agree, Applicant still requests

examination of the claims of the elected group, i.e., claims 2-25.

Applicant's election is made without traverse. As noted by the Examiner, upon

allowance of a generic claim, Applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to a

species in addition to the elected species, provided all claims to each additional species

are written dependent from or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic

claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. § 1.141. In any case, Applicant retains the right to continue

prosecution of the unelected claims in one or more continuation or divisional applications.

It is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for substantive

examination and such examination is earnestly solicited. However, if upon review of the

above information, the Examiner has any questions concerning the same, the Examiner is

invited to contact Applicant's attorneys at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,

MINNICH & MCKEE, LLP

January 9, 2006

Date

Erik J. Overberger, Reg. No. 48,556

1100 Superior Avenue. 7th Floor

Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579

(216)861-5582